I N D E X Of

WITNESSES

Prosecution's Witnesses	Page
MORISHIMA, Morito (resumed)	3071
Cross by Mr. Kaino " " Mr. McCormack " " Captain Kleiman " " Mr. Ohta " " Major Blakeney " " Mr. Brooks " " Mr. Sammonji By the President	3071 3072 3084 3102 3103 3107 3113 3120
MAEDA, Tamon	3122
Direct by Mr. Hammack	3122
Cross by Major Blakeney " Mr. McManus " Captain Kleiman " Mr. Ohara	3127 3129 3144 3146
NAKAI, Kimbei	3151

1	Friday, 2 August, 1946
2	
3	
4	INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST
5	Court House of the Tribunal War Ministry Building
6	Tokyo, Japan
7	The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment,
8	at 0930.
9	
10	
11	Appearances:
12	For the Tribunal, same as before.
13	For the Prosecution Section, same as before.
14	For the Defense Section, same as before.
16	
17	
13	(Further to Tonouses and Tonouses
	(English to Japanese and Japanese
19	to English interpretation was made by the
20	Language Section, IMTFE.)
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

25

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International 1 Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session. 2 THE PRESIDENT: Does any counsel desire to 3 mention any matter? 4 MR. KAINO: I am KAINO, counsel for the defen-5 dant SUZUKI, Teiichi. 6 MORITO MORISHIMA, called as a witness 7 on behalf of the prosecution, resumed the stand 8 and testified as follows: 9 CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued) 10 BY MR. KAINO: 11 Would you state for the record the name of 12 the chief of the special service organization in Mukden, 13 of which you made testimony in your affidavit? 14 THE MONITOR: Whose last name is SUZUKI. 15 Will you state his first name? 16 A SUZUKI, Yoshimitsu. 17 Is Mr. SUZUKI, Yoshimitsu, a different person 13 from SUZUKI, Mr. SUZUKI, one of the accused? 19 Yes, they are different persons. A 20 MR. FUPNESS: 'If the Court please, I meant to 21 bring this up when you asked if there are any matters 22 counsel wish to bring up at this time. 23

When I introduced Exhibit 246 into evidence, I

asked for leave to withdraw the original and substitute

1	
1	therefor a photostatic copy. The Court admitted the
2	evidence but I think did not rule on my request to with
3	draw.
4	I am authorized to state by Mr. Darsey that
5	the prosecution has no objection to this.
6	THE PRESIDENT: We give you leave to do that,
7	Major Furness.
8	Mr. McCormack.
9	MR. McCORMACK: If the Court please, I repre-
10	sent the accused MINAMI.
11	
12	Q Mr. MORISHIMA, do you remember when Premier
13	TANAKA came into office?
14	A I think it was in the spring of 1927.
15	Q Do you remember what political party was in
16	control of that particular cabinet?
17	A Seiyukai.
18	Q What was the name of the other political party
19	in existence at that time?
20	A The Minseito.
21	Q Now, was the Minseito Party for expansion in
22	Manchuria or against it?
23	MR. DARSEY: I object to that, Mr. President,
24	on the ground it is without the scope of the direct
25 *	examination, without the scope of the affidavit, and

 makes no difference to any issue in this proceeding what any other political party felt about expansion in Manchuria.

MR. McCORMACK: There is an indication in this affidavit, from the reading of it, that beginning with the TANAKA Cabinet the governmental policy here in Tokyo become more positive, and it is indicated that the succeeding cabinets became more positive than that cabinet.

THE PRESIDENT: What particular paragraph do you refer to, Mr. McCormack?

MR. McCORMACK: Well, beginning on page 2, the third full paragraph, it says, "When Premier TANAKA came into office he announced a more positive policy."

Then, from a reading of the full affidavit it is shown that while this witness was in office there were at least four cabinets during those -- from 1928 to 1933. And inasmuch as the affidavit sets out more positive action in China, that inference may readily be drawn by members of this Tribunal as to the more positive action of the succeeding cabinets.

THE PRESIDENT: No doubt this affidavit deals with a number of very broad issues.

MR. DARSEY: I call the Court's attention that there is nothing in the affidavit with respect to the

philosophy of any other political party. THE PRESIDENT: Well, it is not easy to determine how far you should go into the party politics of Japan, certainly. I do not think it is relevant to show the difference in the political outlook of the parties, Mr. McCormack. But you can trace the attitude of the party in power for the time being. MR. McCORMACK: I can follow the Court's suggestion, but I cannot get a mental picture of exactly what the Court has in mind. I am not interested so much in the TANAKA but in the inference that the succeeding cabinets during the happening of these things in the affidavit became worse in a positive direction, you sec.

THE PRESIDENT: Frame your questions without regard to the party political question.

MR. McCORMACK: Leave the parties out? THE PRESIDENT: The party political aspect of the parties in power.

MR. McCORMACK: All right.

THE PRESIDENT: The political complexion of the government does not matter; the party political complexion, and the objection is to that only.

MR. McCORMACK: Thank you, your Honor.

MR. DARSEY: I should also like to call the

2

1

4 5

6

7 8

9

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17

13

20

19

21

22

23

Con

Court's attention to the fact that the affidavit does not deal with the cabinets in the interim between the TANAKA Cabinet and the Manchurian Incident. It makes reference to the growing strength and influence of the army in political policies during that period.

Q Mr. Witness, when you use the words "positive policy," tell the Tribunal exactly what you have in mind when you use those words.

A By the positive policy of the TANAKA Cabinet,
I meant to say the maintenance of law and order in Manchuria, the protection of the lives and property of
Japanese nationals resident in that area, and the protection of Japan's legitimate interests in that area;
also, the protection of Japanese lives and property
and legitimate interests on the China continent;
Furthermore, non-interference in the domestic affairs
of China, the promotion of amicable relations between
Japan and China, and also the observance of the principles of the open-door and equal opportunity. On
these points the policy of the TANAKA Cabinet was not
different from those of other preceding cabinets.

Q Now, how many cabinets were in existence in Japan at the time you were Assistant Consul General in Mukden?

A As I recall, the TANAKA Cabinet, the HAMAGUCHI

Cabinet, the INUKAI Cabinet, and the SAITO Cabinet, 1 successively in that order. Does the witness remember the WAKATSUKI Cabinet? A Yes, I do. 4 And was that cabinet in existence during the 5 period of time you were with the government in Mukden? A Yes. Now, the two succeeding cabinets, the HAMAGUCHI and the WAKATSUKI cabinets followed the TANAKA. Has 9 the witness an opinion as to what the policy of those 10 two cabinets was with reference to the TANAKA Cabinet? 11 MR. DARSEY: I object to that as being without 13 the scope of the affidavit. As I previously stated, the affidavit deals with the growing strength and in-15 fluence of the army in political matters and not with 16 the policies of any succeeding cabinet. MR. McCORMACK: This is the same objection 18

counsel made before, if the Court please.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, irrespective of the scope of the affidavit, which is very broad, we may have to limit cross-examination to what we think is useful. I am unable to say that the question just put is beyond the scope of the affidavit. But it does not follow that we will make the scope of the affidavit the test as to the extent of the cross-examination that will

3

6

7

12

14

17

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

1	be permitted. We want really helpful cross-examination
2	What are you endeavoring to establish, Mr.
3	McCormack?
4	MR. McCORMACK: It is the purpose of this
5	question to bring out from the witness the fact that the
6	two succeeding cabinets were so opposite to what is
7	called a positive or aggressive policy over there that
8	they actually fell, had to give up. Politics threw
9	them out of office over here. My client was in one of
10	those.
11	THE PRESIDENT: If you want to prove that
12	MINAMI was a member of & cabinet which was opposed to
13	aggression in Manchuria you could get that out of the
14	witness in a couple of questions. If he knows.
15	MR. McCORMACK: Counsel would be on his feet
16	objecting because MINAMI is not mentioned in the affi-
17	davit. I have got to get it from something that
18	appears in verbiage in the affidavit to satisfy counsel
19	THE PRESIDENT: Well, we will allow you to get
20	that much.
21	MR. DARSEY: Mr. President, I anticipated
22	that that was the purpose of counsel and I submit that
23	that is a matter of affirmative defense and wholly

without the scope of this affidavit.

THE PRESIDENT: We will permit a few short

questions of the kind I have indicated.

Q Mr. Witness, my client, General MINAMI, was
War Minister in the WAKATSUKI Cabinet that was in existence from April, 1931, to December, 1931, eight months.
Can you tell the Tribunal what the policy of that
WAKATSUKI Cabinet was as compared to, say, the TANAKA
Cabinet that you mention in your affidavit?

A First of all, I should say that it is a mistake to state as a premise that the positive policy of the TANAKA Cabinet was an aggressive one. The word "aggressive" is inaccurate.

As I said before, the positive policy of the TANAKA Cabinet was the protection of interests, the ways and means and methods of protecting those interests.

If I am asked to state the difference between the two cabinets I should say that the policy, the Manchurian policy, of the HAMAGUCHI Cabinet was limited to the protection of vested interests in that area. However, the policy of the TANAKA Cabinet placed its primary emphasis on the securing and maintenance of law and order in all of Manchuria.

Greenberg & Barton

	ପୃ	What	has	the	witness	got	to	say	with	refor-
enco	to	the W	AKATS	SUKT	Cabinet	?				

A Nothing beyond what I have already stated.

THE PRESIDENT: He said "HAMAGUCHI."

MR. McCORMACK: The witness mentioned the word "HAMAGUCHI" as being the other cabinet besides the TANAKA. Now, the WAKATSUKI Cabinet followed the HAMAGUCHI, and I was most interested in finding out what the policy of that cabinet was because my client was a member of it.

THE WITNESS: Both the HAMAGUCHI and WAKATSUKI Cabinets were organized by the same Minseito
Party, and, therefore, there was no difference in the
policies of these two cabinets, and, therefore, whatever I have said previously with respect to these
cabinets applies in this case.

Q The witness, in his affidavit, mentions the sending of Japanese troops in 1927 and 1928 into China proper. I'd like to have the witness describe the situation so the Tribunal will understand exactly what that was as far as Japan is concerned -- the sending of troops.

MR. DARSEY: I suggest that the question is repetitive, Mr. President. That matter was covered yesterday.

24

25

I do not recall anything.

THE PRESIDENT: Did he answer that question 1 yesterday? 2 MR. McCORMACK: It is my contention he 3 didn't because I scratched out from my list of ques-4 tions all the questions I thought were answered as 5 6 they were put to this witness. 7 THE PRESIDENT: Answer the question, wit-8 ness. 9 I feel that I answered that question yesterday, but I shall repeat it again by saying that the 10 11 Northern expeditionary -- punitive expeditionary 12 forces entered the province of Shantung because of 13 the danger that existed to Japanese lives and property 14 in that area. And, in order to safeguard these lives 15 and property, troops were despatched on the spot. 16 Who despatched the troops? At whose com-17 mand did they go into China proper? 18 A I do not remember. 19 Did your office in Mukden at the time have 20 anything to do with the reasons why the Japanese 21 troops were necessary? 22 That being outside the province of my work,

When it is stated in an affidavit that Japan-

ese troops were sent somewhere, it may be indicated

that they violated some treaties, or something of
that sort, in going in there and meeting the Chinese
Army. Can you tell the Court whether or not that is
a fact?

MR. DARSEY: I object to that, Mr. President. It is for this Court to determine whether or
not treaties were violated in the despatch of troops
into China.

MR. McCORMACK: I am just interested in the Court getting some information here. If I don't know the reason, I don't know how the Tribunal can, and it may be important.

THE PRESIDENT: I think he should attempt to answer the question.

A I think it is sufficient to say, as I have already said, that the despatch of troops was carried out for the protection of Japanese lives and property, in China, which was then in danger.

THE PRESIDENT: He is not suggesting any breach of a treaty.

Q Do you know whether that matter was settled amicably by the Chinese and Japanese?

A The settlement of the Tsinan Incident took quite a long time, but the problem was settled amicably between Japan and China.

	THE PRESIDENT: I would like to be able to
1	say that this cross-examination is helping us, Mr.
2	McCormack, but I cannot.
3	Q Now, Mr. Witness, in your affidavit you
4	make mention of "China proper." What do you mean
5	by the use of those words?
6	THE PRESIDENT: We have no doubt as to what
7	he means.
8	MR. McCORMACK: Is the question disallowed?
9	THE PRESIDENT: We will let him answer.
10	You will have a grievance if we do not.
11	A By "China proper" I mean China with the
12	exception of the three Northeastern provinces.
13	Q During the time you were in office from
14	1928 to '33 how many different governments were there
16	in China proper?
17	MR. DARSEY: I object to that.
18	THE PRESIDENT: Objection allowed.
19	Q During what year or years was Marshal
20	Chang Tso-Ling Marshal of Manchuria?
21	A I do not recall. It was for a long time.
22	Without a reference book, I could not say at this
23	time.
24	Q Now, was Chang Tso-Ling acting for or
	against the Chiang Kai-shek Government in China?

MR. DARSEY: I object'to that.

2

1

THE PRESIDENT: Objection allowed.

3

Now, in the collaboration of Premier TANAKA

4

with Chang Tso-Ling as Marshal of Manchuria, did you

5

at any time have any personal knowledge of such

6

collaboration?

7

THE PRESIDENT: Collaboration when, where,

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and about what? What I mean by "collaboration" is not

on any particular question, and I think it would be -- it is improper to use the word "collaboration." I should say that Premier TANAKA cooperated with Marshal Chang in the settlement of various issues.

Can you name the issues that they cooperatively settled?

THE PRESIDENT: It is not for the Court to take objections ordinarily, but we are always at liberty to tell you that your cross-examination does not help.

During the time of the TANAKA Cabinet, agreement was reached with Marshal Chang in connection with the building of new railway lines, but this proved to be abortive as a result of the death of Marshal Chang.

Was Chang Tso-Ling the proper person for

Premier TANAKA to contact as being the head of Manchuria at that time?

A So long as Chang Tso-Ling was the actual leader of the Eastern provinces, whether he was proper or improper or otherwise, TANAKA had no other person to negotiate with.

Q What do you mean when you state that Premier TANAKA was "lending support" to Marshal Chang Tso-Ling?

A For many years the policy of reinforcing national defense and preservation of peace was the policy of the Marshal in Manchuria, and it was the belief of Premier TANAKA that Chang Tso-Ling should stay in Manchuria -- it would be proper for Marshal Chang Tso-Ling to stay in Manchuria to carry out this policy instead of penetrating outside of that area into China proper.

THE MONITOR: And it would be proper for Chang Tso-Ling to stay in Manchuria and develop Manchuria.

Q Now, did the clique of officers, as you say in your affidavit, in the Kwantung Army at any time have any sound reason to believe that the Japanese should employ force to preserve their interests in Manchuria?

1 2

MR. DARSEY: I object.

THE PRESIDENT: He cannot testify as to their bona fides.

Q What were the reasons that prompted this clique of officers to feel as though force should be employed? You were living over there. You must have talked to them. Let the Court know about it.

A In a word, I should say that the antiJapanese atmosphere in that area was extremely
strong, and it was necessary to resort to the use of
force in order to carry out the Manchurian policy
under such circumstances. I should think this reply should be sufficient.

THE PRESIDENT: They did not tell him anything, apparently. He is just guessing what their motives or their reasons were. His answer is of no assistance.

Q Do you know what the method was that this group of officers used to influence governmental policy?

A I should think there are various and many methods. They are so varied, in accordance with different circumstances, that I think it would be difficult to name all of them -- it would be impossible to name all of them.

Q State the principal reason or the principal method or methods as you remember them.

THE PRESIDENT: I do not think that form of corss-examination is proper. You should suggest reasons to him.

MR. McCORMACK: If the Court please, I cannot be expected to have the supposed knowledge Mr. Witness has. He is a particularly qualified person in Japanese and Chinese relations, and I am no authority. I would like to get some information from the witness, not teach him.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, if we allow you to do it, we must allow every other counsel, and it is not the right thing, and you know it is not.

MR. McCORMACK: I'm taking things out of this statement that the Court mentions the Court is not interested in. If direct examination was made of this witness, there would probably be only a half-dozen questions to ask him, but these statements of lengthy conclusions, and everything else, dumbfound us here. We don't know what the Court is going to take into consideration.

THE PRESIDENT: We will take into consideration that he is a consul and not a prime minister and that, having regard to what his office is, his

But, later, at the cabinet meeting, as I recall, as a result of army opposition, the matter merely ended in suspension of office. For this reason, Premier TANAKA and his cabinet were forced to resign.

Q The succeeding cabinet, the HAMAGUCHI -- do you know the reasons why they fell?

THE PRESIDENT: There again you see how unfair that is. You should suggest to him why it fell, and you should show the suggestion is associated with the subject under review.

MR. DARSEY: I suggest it is without the scope of the affidavit.

THE PRESIDENT: It is hard to say what is within or without the scope of that affidavit. However, the question is imporper. Counsel should know the particular answer that his question should draw forth.

W o l f	1	Q Mr. Witness, do you remember that the
	2	reason why the Hamaguchi Cabinet resigned was that
f	3	Premier HAMAGUCHI died?
&	4	THE PRESIDENT: What has that to do with
Sp	5	Manchuria?
r	6	MR. McCORMICK: I am following that; I
att	7	want to get it logical.
	8	Q Mr. Witness, do you know whether or not
	9	the Incident of September 18, 1931, caused the fall
	10	of the Wakatsuki Cabinet?
	11	A The other day I read the testimony of Baron
	12	WAKATSUKI, who appeared here to testify, in a news-
1	13	paper.
	14	Q In other words, your answer is in the affirm-
	15	ative, is it?
	16	A No, I do not affirm nor deny that question.
	17	Q Now, did Chang Hsueh-Liang succeed to the
	18	leadership of Chang Tso-Ling?
	19	A Yes.
	20	Q Were their policies of collaboration and
	21	negotiation with Japanese policies the same?
	22	A As I said before, after Chang Hsueh-Liang
į.	23	became the leader of Manchuria anti-Japanese move-
	24	ments began to be promoted on an organized basis
	25	with an ideological background, and gained greatly

24

25

after the Incident?

1	
1	in its intensity.
2	Q What was the reason for that?
3	A I think that was as a result of the fact
4	that Chang Hsueh-Liang became a member of the
5	Kuomingtang and also because of the infiltration of
6	the Sanmingchuyi, or the Three-Peoples Principle.
7	Q Now, what do you mean by the statement,
8	"the policy of restoration of national rights under
9	the leadership of Chang Hsueh-Liang"?
10	THE PRESIDENT: We do not want him to
11	explain the obvious.
12	Q Do you know why General TATEKAWA went to
13	Mukden in September, 1931?
14	A I did not know at that time, but later, by
15	the developments which took place, I learned that he
16	was sent from the central army authorities.
17	Q Do you know who sent him, particularly?
18	of the central authori-
19	ties, I do not know exactly, but I presume it was the
20	then War Minister MINAMI, and the Chief of the Army
21	General Staff, whose name I do not recall just at
22	
23	this moment.
10.00	Q Did you know, of your own knowledge, what

happened to General TATEKAWA when he got to Mukden

A No, I do not.

Q Do you know of any other officer sent by the war Minister at that time over to Mukden in relation to this Incident -- in localizing or stopping it?

A I do not remember the date exactly, but shortly after the Incident three officers, namely, Major General HASHIMOTO, Major ENDO, and Captain IMAI were sent by the central army authorities to Mukden, and I think, if I am not mistaken, that their purpose was to communicate to the Kwantung Army the intentions of the central army authorities, with respect to the Incident.

Q What were those intentions?

A I believe it was non-expansion of the Incident and settlement of the Incident on the spot.

Q Now, Mr. Witness, do you know whether or not the War Minister in Tokyo at that time had anything to do with the outbreak of this Incident?

A. I presume that it was following discussions between the Minister for War and the Chief of the Army General Staff that Major General HASHIMOTO and his party were sent to Mukden.

THE PRESIDENT: You surely do not think those answers are going to help us.

MR. McCORMICK: My last question was either

4

2

3

6

8

10

11

12

13

15

14

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

	misunderstood, or I did not get it over properly.
1	May I ask it over again of the witness?
2	Q' Do you know whether or not the War Minister
3	in Tokyo, at the time of the Manchurian Incident,
4	had any part to play in that Incident in its
5	happening?
6	THE PRESIDENT: He could not know unless
7	MR. McCORMICK: Well, I am asking him.
8	MR. DARSEY: I object to it as being out-
10	side the scope of the direct.
11	THE PRESIDENT: Objection upheld.
12	Q Now, in the last paragraph of your affi-
13	davit, you mentioned that general orders were issued
14	on the night of September 18 that called all the
15	Japanese armies in Manchuria into operation. Who
16	issued these orders, if you know?
17	A I think it was issued in the name of the
18	Commander in Chief of the Kwantung Army, General
19	HONJO.
20	Q And was he situated over in Manchuria at
21	the time?
22	A Yes, he was.
23	THE PRESIDENT: We will recess now for
24	fifteen minutes.
25	(Whereupon, at 1043, a recess was

.

.

who opposed.

G oldbe	1	MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International
		Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.
d	2	THE PRESIDENT: Captain Kleiman.
e	3	CROSS-EXAMINATION
g	4	BY CAPTAIN KLEIMAN:
&	5	
В	6	Q Mr. MORISHIMA, referring to your statement
a	7	on page Seven concerning the Japanese recognition
to	8	of Manchukuo, do you mean thereby the Japanese Govern-
n	9	ment's recognition of Manchukuo?
	10	A Yes.
	11	Q Prior to this recognition, had not the Japan.
	12	ese Government opposed military action in Manchuria?
	13	A Yes. At the outbreak of the incident the
	14	policy of the Government was non-extension of the
	15	incident and, therefore, opposed expansion of mili-
	16	tary action.
	17	Q Prior to this recognition, had not the
	18	Japanese Government opposed the establishment of
	19	an independent government in Manchuria?
	20	A I should think it would be difficult to
	21	say "opposition of the Japanese Government." From
	22	my knowledge, I should say that there were those who
	23	were opposed within the Japanese Government, that
	24	is, within the Japanese Government there were men
		To a manufacture of the second

Do you know who was the Prime Minister during the Manchukuoan -- the Japanese Government's recognition of Manchukuo?

THE PRESIDENT: If he does not, we do.

CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: All right, your Honor.

I wanted to ask that as a preliminary question, if

it please the Court.

THE PRESIDENT: They are preliminary too.

A Yes, Viscount SAITO.

Q If you know, will you please tell us why the Japanese Government recognized Manchukuo despite the fact that they previously had opposed military action in Manchukuo?

MR. DARSEY: I object to that as wholly irrelevant and immaterial and without the scope of the direct.

THE PRESIDENT: Objection upheld.

captain kleiman: If it please the Tribunal, yesterday we had introduced an exhibit concerning the Japanese recognition of Manchukuo. Would it not be clearer for the Court if the entire question, the facts of the entire question, if they can be testified to by this witness, were presented to the Court at this time rather than wait to, perhaps, four or five months later?

THE PRESIDENT: I am not going to debate 1 the Court's decision. 2 CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: All right, your Honor. 3 Mr. MORISHIMA, by recognition of Manchukuo, 4 if you know, did not the Japanese Government hope 5 to have a diplomatic means of peaceably settling 6 Sino-Japanese issues, rather than to allow the inci-7 dents that have occurred to which you have testified? 8 MR. DARSEY: I object to that question. 9 THE PRESIDENT: Objection upheld. 10 Mr. MORISHIMA, by recognition of Manchukuo, 11 did not the Japanese Government hope to gain control 12 over Manchuria to take it away from the military? 13 14 MR. DARSEY: I object to the question. 15 THE PRESIDENT: Objection upheld. Mr. MORISHIMA, if you know, had the Privy 16 Council ever been involved in Manchurian affairs be-17 18 fore the Japanese Government's recognition of Man-19 chukuo? 20 To my knowledge, it did not interfere in A Manchurian affairs. According to the ordinance govern-21

ing -- regulating the Privy Council, the Privy Council

23

22

24

Q

	has no part, does not involve itself in questions
1	of government policy. However, as the highest ad-
3	visory organ, it expresses its views when asked.
4	The Privy Council, if I may add further, does not
5.	express any positive views on government policy.
6	It expresses itself or announces its views or hopes
7	only when it is required or requested to do so. As
8	a matter of custom, generally speaking, the Privy
9	Council merely formally recognizes or approves what-
10	ever has been previously decided by the Government.
11	Q Referring to Page Two of your affidavit,
12	Mr. MORISHIMA, you mention the TANAKA positive policy.
13	Did the TANAKA policy entail the conquest of China?
14	MR. DARSEY: I object to the question as
15	being without the scope of the direct.
16	THE PRESIDENT: Objection upheld.
17	Q Mr. MORISHIMA, can you tell us any facts
18	about whether the TANAKA Memorial was a fact or fake?
19	MR. DARSEY: There has been no reference made
20	by this witness to the TANAKA Memorial. It is with-
21	out the scope of the direct, and I object to it.
22	THE PRESIDENT: Ask him whether he ever heard
23	of the TANAKA Memorial.
24	CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: All right, sir.

Mr. MORISHIMA, have you ever heard of the

TANAKA Memorial?

2

1

3

4

6

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

24

25

A Yes, I heard, but I also know that it is a fake.

me questions to show that the TANAKA Memorial is a fake? I am cross-examining. I don't know what the witness will answer.

THE PRESIDENT: From our viewpoint there is no need for the witness to elaborate his answer. We refuse permission for further cross-examination, to further cross-examine.

CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: All right, sir. I will withdraw that question, if it please the Tribunal.

Q Mr. MORISHIMA, in the last paragraph on page Five of your affidavit, you refer to the "right of military command." What do you mean by that?

THE PRESIDENT: There is no need to answer that question.

CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: All right, sir.

Q Mr. MORISHIMA, on Page Three of your affidavit you make mention of the fact that 'many incidents
occurred which might be attributed to anti-Japanese
feeling" and that "the Consulate made greatest efforts
to settle these incidents." Can you mention some of
these incidents that you are referring to?

1	THE PRESIDENT: The answer was given yester
2	day.
3	CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: I see, your Honor.
4	Q Mr. MORISHIMA, did these incidents involve
5	Japanese-Chinese disputes concerning property of
6	Japanese nationals, railway rights, debts owed by
7	China to Japan?
8	THE PRESIDENT: The question is repetitive.
9	CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: All right, your Honor.
10	Q Prior to the Mukden Incident, had not Japan
11	made about three hundred protests to China because
12	of violation of various treaty rights and disregard
13	of rights of nationals and of property of Japanese
14	nationals?
15	MR. DARSEY: I object to the question. It
16	is without the scope of the direct.
17	THE PRESIDENT: Objection upheld.
18	Q Mr. MORISHIMA: I will read you a statement
19	and ask you if you know whether this statement is a
20	truth or not. "Concerning the Manchurian question,
21	the Japanese Government
22	THE PRESIDENT: Now you can only read a
23	statement like that if it is necessary. Why not
24	frame a short statement on the question?

CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: All right, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: You see the trouble these 1 interpreters are getting into. 2 CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: Yes, sir, your Honor. 3 am sorry, sir. 4 Did the WAKATSUKI Cabinet, HAMAGUCHI Cabinet, 5 INUKAI Cabinet or the SAITO Cabinet adopt, support 6 and continue military aggression into Manchuria and 7 its gradual extension over other parts of China? 8 MR. DARSEY: The question is objectionable 9 on many scores: The first, because it is compound; 10 the second, because it requires this witness to 11 determine an ultimate fact which should be determined 12 by the Court. 13 THE PRESIDENT: I assume you object. 14 The objection is upheld. 15 Mr. MORISHIMA, if you know, did not all the 16 contracting parties to the Kellogg Pact reserve the 17 right to self-defense in putting their signatures on 18 19 the Kellogg Pact? MR. DARSEY: Mr. President, it is not pleasant 20 21 for me to have to get up and object to each question 22 propounded here, but, obviously, this question is

THE PRESIDENT: Objection upheld.

CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: I am through with my

24 25

23

improper.

1000	
1	THE PRESIDENT: You see the trouble these
2	interpreters are getting into.
3	CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: Yes, sir, your Honor. I
4	am sorry, sir.
5	Q Did the WAKATSUKI Cabinet, HAMAGUCHI Cabinet,
6	INUKAI Cabinet or the SAITO Cabinet adopt, support
7	and continue military aggression into Manchuria and
8	its gradual extension over other parts of China?
9	MR. DARSEY: The question is objectionable
10	on many scores: The first, because it is compound;
11	the second, because it requires this witness to
12	determine an ultimate fact which should be determined
13	by the Court.
14	THE PRESIDENT: I assume you object. The
15	objection is upheld.
16	Q Mr. MORISHIMA, if you know, did not all the
17	contracting parties to the Kellogg Pact reserve the
18	right to self-defense in putting their signatures on
19	the Kellogg Pact?
20	MR. DARSEY: Mr. President, it is not pleasan
21	for me to have to get up and object to each question
22	propounded here, but, obviously, this question is

THE PRESIDENT: Objection upheld.

CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: I am through with my

24

23

improper.

questions. If it ple-se the Tribunal, so that I may know how to conduct myself with respect to the future witnesses, will the Tribunal permit us to ask questions to show the full picture? THE PR SIDENT. Oh, don't ask such silly questions. CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: To show that, perhaps, the Chinese War -- Manchurian War was conducted by Japan as a matter of self-defense guaranteed to it by the Kellogg Pact?

THE PRESIDENT: The Court will deal with questions as they arise for determination. It will not answer hypothetical questions.

CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: Thank you, your Honor. No further questions.

16

1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

MR. OHTA: I am OHTA, Kinjiro, counsel for 1 the defendant DOHIHARA. I would like to ask a ques-2 tion to the witness, Mr. MORISHIMA. CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued) å BY MR. OHTA: M On September 18, 1931, that is the day of r 6 the outbreak of the Manchurian Incident, was not e 7 DOHIHARA situated in Manchuria? 8 MONITOR: Correction: Is it not a fact that 9 DOHIHARA was not actually in Manchuria. 10 I don't know whether he was there on the 11 18th of September, but after that I do know that he 12 was not there. I ascertained it. 13 Where was he then? Did you find out about 14 that later? 15 A He was in Korea. 16 Do you know of the fact that he went to 17 Tokyo to report on NAKAMURA, Hsintaro Incident? 13 I do not recall. Inasmuch as there was 19 A such a heavy traffic with China, that I don't know. 20 What was the reason for which the accused 21 DOHIHARA was in Korea, in spite of the fact that he 22 held such an important position as that of the 23

chief of Special Service organization?

MR. DARSEY: I object to the line of ques-

24

1	tions as being without the scope of the direct.
2	THE PRESIDENT: Objection upheld.
3	Q Do you know if DOHIHARA was connected with
	the Manchurian Incident?
4	A I think he did not have any connection with
5	the incident.
6	Q What was his influence over the Kwantung
7	
8	Army?
9	MR. DARSEY: Object to the question.
10	THE PRESIDENT: Objection upheld.
11	Q How about the reputation of DOHIHARA
12	division in North China.
13	MR. DARSEY: Object to the question.
14	THE PRESIDENT: Objection upheld.
15	MR. OHTA: That is all, your Honor.
16	THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.
17	CHOSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)
18	BY MAJOR BLAKENEY:
19	Mr. Witness, during the Manchurian Incident
20	and the subsequent years covered by the testimony in
21	your affidavit did China and Japan ever sever
22	diplomatic relations?
23	MR. DARSEY: I object to the question as
24	being without the scope of the direct.
25	MAJOR BLAKENEY: I should like to be heard

on that point, if the Court permits.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

MAJOR BLAKENEY: The witness in his affidavit does not confine himself to the Mukden Incident of September, 1931. He discusses later events and even on page 7, the last page of his affidavit, discusses the status of the so-called Empire of Manchukuo down to 1945. Mr. Darsey, in opening this phase of the case, stated on page 1679 of the record that evidence would be introduced under specific counts of the Indictment there referred to to prove the waging -- the planning, initiating and waging of a war of aggression in connection with the Manchurian Incident. We therefore have the testimony of this witness and we have the prosecution's statement of its purport or intent. I submit to the Tribunal that in those circumstances we must be able to cross-examine the witnesses concerning the actions of the parties which would have made or would not have made this a war of aggression.

THE PRESIDENT: Objection overruled.

MAJOR BLAKENEY: The witness will answer the question, please.

THE PRESIDENT: Did China and Japan sever diplomatic relations?

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

10

9

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

20

21

22

23

1	A It has never been severed.
2	Q Then the two countries maintained friendly,
3	normal diplomatic intercourse and did not consider
4	that, a state of war existed between them.
5	MR. DARSEY: I object to that on the ground
6	that it calls for a conclusion of the witness.
7	THE PRESIDENT: Yes. That objection should
8	be upheld.
9	Q The state of affairs which you have tes-
10	tified to concerning the non-severance of diplomatic
11	relations prevailed as well before as after the
12	Manchurian Incident, is that correct?
13	A Yes, it has never been severed.
14	Q Did any other nation, and especially the
15	nations named in this Indictment as accusers, sever
16	diplomatic relations with Japan as a result of the
17	Manchurian Incident?
18	MR. DARSEY: I object to that as being wholly
19	without the scope of the direct examination.
20	THE PRESIDENT: Objection upheld.
21	Q In connection with the Manchurian Incident,
22	Mr. Witness, you testified before and gave data to
23	the Lytton Commission, did you not?
24	A Yes, I have.
25	Q Were you familiar in your official capacity

25

1	
1	with the Lytton Commission and with the League of
2	Nations itself, in connection with the Manchurian
3	Incident?
4	MR. DARSEY: I object to this line of
5	questions as being wholly without the scope of the
6	direct.
7	THE PRESIDENT: What is the purpose of it,
8	Major Blakeney?
9	MAJOR BLAKENEY: The purpose, sir, is to
10	show by the most important eye witness of these
11	events who has yet been produced what the factual
12	situation was in all its aspects, not only
13	THE PRESIDENT: Well, that wouldn't let that
14	question in. You are not challenging his evidence
15	before the Lytton Commission, are you?
16	MAJOR BLAKENEY: No, sir, not at all. I am
17	merely attempting to expand this man's background
18	of knowledge beyond the events of the night of 18
19	September. He has testified to events at other
20	times, but has not shown his official connection or
21	background.
22	THE PRESIDENT: Well, there would be no
23	limit to that form of questioning.

MAJOR BLAKENEY: It is submitted, sir, that

under the Tribunal's rulings the limit is to matters

24

25

ment.

to which he has testified, and I submit that I am within that. 2 THE PRESIDENT: We take it up to now he has 3 told us all he knows about the Mukden Incident, but 4 if you are not satisfied you can suggest to him that 5 he has withheld something and state what it is. 6 MAJOR BLAKENEY: No, sir, that is not my 7 position, and I will conclude my cross-examination 8 under that ruling. 9 THE PRESIDENT: Captain Brooks. 10 MR. BROOKS: I am Mr. Brooks, American coun-11 sel for OKLWA. 12 CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued) 13 14 BY MR. BROOKS: Q Mr. Witness, what were your duties as to 15 arranging for the protection of Japanese nationals 16 in peacetime. A On the basis of the right of extra-territorit-18 ality, a large consular police existed and so that 19 means of protection of Japanese nationals resident 20 in Manchuria was carried out. Furthermore, proper 21 steps were taken if and when and in accordance with 22

any situation as it arose with the Chinese Govern-

MONITOR: Slight correction: One was to

h

have the consular police under this territorial right; another was to keep in constant touch with Chinese and solve any problem and all in all always to take proper measures, depending on the situation.

Q Were these consular police stationed at one place and called only in event of emergency or were they stationed throughout Mukden?

THE PRESIDENT: How do you suggest that will help us, Captain Brooks?

MR. BROOKS: I want to ask him why, if the consular police were stationed throughout Mukden, why that was necessary. Was it because of certain conditions there of murder, which was commonly being reported, of the Japanese subjects, being so prevalent that it was necessary to have them stationed throughout the country, rather than at one place, which would normally be the condition of troops being stationed at one place, if there were just peaceful relations going on between the people, and then when an incident arose they might go out and take care of it. As a background, I think that is very important.

THE PRESIDENT: An adequate police force is a feature of every orderly community.

MR. BROOKS: I didn't catch it, your Honor.
Will the reporter read it?

(Whereupon, the last statement by 1 the President was read by the official court reporter.) 3 THE PRESIDENT: Do you suggest that the 4 number of police there was out of proportion to the 5 number of people? 6 MR. BHOOKS: As I believe, the police force 7 that was there, of the Japanese, numbered around 8 15 thousand, whereas the Chinese troops in the area 9 numbered around 200 thousand, and that the Japanese 10 police were scattered over wide areas and were still 11 within the treaty rights under the Boxer Protocol, and 12 I believe the Court is assuming that there were 13 adequate police forces in that territory. 14 THE PRESIDENT: Well, put questions on that 15 16 basis. 17 MR. BROOKS: That was the basis of my 18 question. 19 THE PRESIDENT: But they are such rambling questions. Can't you shorten them? 20 MR. DARSEY: Counsel is obviously confusing 21 consular police with troops that were stationed in 22 Mukden and Manchuria. The affidavit makes reference 23 to several hundred consular guards having been 24 located there. The purpose of this line of questions 25

25

as indicated by counsel clearly demonstrates its 1 immateriality and irrelevancy. 2 MR. BROOKS: I respect learned prosecutor's 3 argument and his learning, but I do not agree with 4 him. I will withdraw the question previously asked 5 and ask a shorter one. 6 Why were consular police stationed through-7 out Mukden? 8 MR. DARSEY: I object to that question as 9 wholly irrelevant and immaterial. 10 THE PRESIDENT: Objection upheld. 11 Did you receive reports from consular police 12 13 from time to time? 14 Yes, every day. And from the reports that you received from 15 your various sources of information, did you anticipate 16 the trends and developments and report these as con-17 18 clusions to the foreign office? 19 Yes. And were these conclusions and reports made 20 from this wide area as to the trends, developments, 21 conditions and incidents used in formulating the 22 23 policy of Japan for that area?

Yes, I believe it was very valuable data

in the formulation of government policy.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

Included in these reports from consular police, were there any reports of Japanese subjects 2 or residents in Manchuria being murdered by rebels 3 and bandits, or soldiers? 4 MR. DARSEY: I object to the question as 5 being without the scope of the direct and wholly 6

irrelevant and immaterial.

THE PRESIDENT: The whole of the questions put so far could have been reduced to one simple question: did your police report to you the murders of Japanese citizens by Chinese bandits and others? We have listened for half an hour to a long series of useless questions. Such a question -- such a short question -- would be relevant.

> We will recess now until half past one. (Whereupon, at 1200, a recess was taken.)

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

D
u
đ
a
&
VI.
h
a
1
e

AFTERNOON SESSION

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International
Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

M O R I T O M O R I S H I M A , called as a witness
on behalf of the prosecution, resumed the stand
and testified as follows:

CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. BROOKS:

- Q Mr. Witness, did your police report to you any murders of Japanese citizens by Chinese bandits and others during this time?
 - Q Yes, they have.
- Q Approximately how many incidents of this type were reported?

A My tenure of functions at the consulate having been very long, and the jurisdiction of the consulate in Mukden being very large, I cannot tell you the exact number of cases. In general, they were few in the urban areas and many out in the country districts where there were Koreans.

THE MONITOR: Where there were many Koreans residing.

MR. SAMMONJI: I am SAMMONJI, counsel for the defendant KOISO. I wish to cross-examine the witness.

RV	MR	SAMMONJI:	,

1

4

5

6

8

9

10 11

12

13 14

16

15

18

19

17

20

22

2324

25

Q In your affidavit, Mr. Witness, you say that from September, 1928, until December, 1932, you were Consul General in Mukden. After that date what post did you assume?

A From December, 1932, till July, 1935, I was Consul General in Harbin.

Q In August, 1932, the Commander-in-Chief of the Kwantung Army was changed and General MUTO assumed this post. Do you remember that Lieutenant General KOISO assumed the post of Chief of Staff there?

A I do.

THE MONITOR: Correction: "General MUTO" should read "Field Marshal MUTO."

A I know it.

Q What sort of policy did Field Marshal MUTO execute in Manchuria, and what sort of a person is Field Marshal MUTO in character?

MR. DARSEY: I object to the question as being without the scope of the direct.

THE PRESIDENT: Objection allowed.

MR. SAMMONJI: Mr. President, inasmuch as Lieutenant General KOISO served under Field Marshal MUTO as Chief of Staff I do not think it is irrelevant to put my question.

THE PRESIDENT: The objection is allowed.
You must observe my ruling, or the Court's ruling.

Q In the last page of gur affidavit, Mr. Witness, you say that the Kwantung Army sent troops
into Jehol. But this took place in March, 1933,
and it was after you left your post as Consul General
in Mukden. Did you learn this from hearsay, or did
you receive actual reports?

A Even if I was stationed at Harbin I could not confirm these facts unless I had been with the army.

But at Harbin I had knowledge of these facts by general information and all facts which were reported to me.

Q In your affidavit, Mr. Witness, you say that Jehol was a part of Inner Mongolia. However, while you were yet Consul General in Mukden I believe Chang Hsueh-Liang made a declaration to the effect that Jehol was a part of Manchuria and that his control was duly exercised there, isn't that so?

A In making my affidavit I did not use extremely accurate technical, scientific terms. The Manchurian provinces are called either the Three Eastern Provinces or the Four Eastern Provinces. And it is as counsel has said.

Q Are you not aware of the fact that a protocol

1 2

25

was concluded between Japan and Manchukuo? Yes, I know it. 2 If you are aware of this fact perhaps you 3 know that in Article II of the Protocol it says that 4 the Kwantung Army is free to exercise -- that the Kwan-5 tung Army could exercise measures necessary for the 6 defense and maintenance of peace within Manchukuo. 7 MR. DARSEY: I object to the question as 8 being without the scope of the direct. And the Pro-9 tocol speaks for itself. 10 11 THE PRESIDENT: Objection allowed. Is the witness aware of the fact that in the 12 third meeting of the League of Nations in 1932 it was 13 14 decided that the right to put down, to suppress ban-15 ditry in Manchuria was reserved? 16 MR. DARSEY: I object to the question, Mr. 17 President, as being wholly irrelevant and immaterial 18 and outside the scope of the direct. 19 THE PRESIDENT: Objection allowed. 20 If you know, Mr. Witness, will you please 21 tell us, did peace and order exist in Jehol Province 22 before mopping-up operations by the Japanese Army? 23 MR. DARSEY: I object, Mr. President. It is

awfully embarrassing to me to have to get up and ob-

ject to every question propounded here, but obviously

25

the cross-examination cannot be the least helpful 1 along this line. It is wholly irrelevant and immaterial. 3 THE PRESIDENT: Objection allowed. At the 4 same time I would like to observe that your affidavit 5 is largely responsible for all this. This is a most 6 unprofitable day. 7 MR. SAMMONJI: Mr. President, I am only 8 asking the questions on what the witness has stated 9 in his affidavit. I wish to continue this interroga-10 11 tion. THE PRESIDENT: I cannot debate the Court's 12 ruling with you. The objection is allowed and you 13 14 must observe it. MR. SAMMONJI: Before I could make myself 15 clear to the President the President passes his judg-16 ment; therefore, I am unable to put my case before 17 18 him. THE PRESIDENT: You must observe the Court's 19 I am not going to debate it with you, and 20 ruling. we will deal with you if you do not respect our de-21 22 cision. MR. SAMMONJI: I wish to continue. 23

When the Jehol campaign took place, who was

in charge of this campaign?

A It was Tang Yu-Ling, I think.

Q According to your affidavit, Mr. Witness, you claim to have had many sources of information. Do you know that Hsieh Lu-Shih and Tang Yu-Ling were constantly communicating with each other when Field Marshal MUTO was in command?

MR. DARSEY: I object to this question; wholly irrelevant and immaterial.

THE PRESIDENT: Objection allowed.

It looks as though we will have to adjourn and give general instructions to counsel about these matters. We cannot sit here and waste time like this. Nothing that has been brought out today has helped us in the slightest. We have discussed during lunch an adjournment; that is our opinion. That largely arises out of prosecution's having asked this witness to swear to too much in his affidavit. In that afficavit he has made statements right beyond his provinces. He is only a consul general.

MR. SAMMONJI: Mr. President, I refer to the last part of the witness' affidavit. On the problem of Jehol he says that there were no objections raised on the part of the people and the government. According to his affidavit he says that there was no support on the part of both the people and the government.

THE WITNESS: Speaking from a general point of view I stated that there was no spontaneous movement from the people of the province or from the officials. Even if you give one or two exceptions to this I can only say that from a general point of view my opinion was different.

Q You used the words "puppet regime" in your affidavit, Mr. Witness. Exactly what do you mean by "puppet regime"?

A I mean a government which cannot take any action freely, from its own will.

THE PRESIDENT: That is a useless question.

We cannot afford to waste time like this. This is

THE PRESIDENT: That is a useless question. We cannot afford to waste time like this. This is an immense task. It is going to cover a long period in any circumstances.

NR. SAMMONJI: I wish to put another question to the witness.

Q Under Chang Hsueh-Liang did the government function as it did in other civilized nations?

THE MONITOR: Correction: Diplomatic relations.

Q (Continuing) Were diplomatic relations carried out as in other civilized nations?

MR. DARSEY: I object to the question. It is irrelevant and immaterial.

THE PRESIDENT: Objection upheld. Mr. Logan. MR. LOGAN: No further cross-examination. THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Darsey. MR. DARSEY: There is no further direct examination.

G
r
е
е
n
b
е
r
g
&
В
a
r
t
0
n

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

THE PRESIDENT: There are some questions that I desire to ask the witness.

BY THE PRESIDENT:

Q Did you give evidence before the Lytton Commission?

A Yes, I have.

Q Is there any difference between your evidence here and your evidence before that Commission?

In as much as I have no reference book with me here today, I cannot make any statements on minute details. However, I am inclined to think that there are a few differences.

Q And what are they?

A For example, speaking of the independence movement, there may have been some difference at that time as the situation existed then and now.

Q Di 'a testify as to the Mukden Incident?

I did speak on that point. However, Lord Lytton laid most emphasis on how to settle the conflict and the pending problems.

THE MONITOR: Rather than generalization.

Q Did you tell Lord Lytton's Commission what you told us?

Since there were no question to that effect, I did not tell him these things.

12

11

13 14

15

16 17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

THE MONITOR: So I remember. 1 THE PRESIDENT: Yes. That will do. 2 (Whereupon, the witness was 3 excused.) 4 MR. DARSEY: No further direct, Mr. . 5 6 President. This concludes the presentation of this 7 phase of the case with the exception of some examin-8 9 ation of a witness that will be put on in the China

ed by Judge McKenzie at that time.

The Court will recall that during Mr.

Hammack's period there was a witness who was to be recalled for some further examination. At this time I turn the proceedings over to Mr. Hammack.

Aggression period which examination will be conduct-

MR. HAMMACK: May it please the Court, I wish at this time to recall the witness MAEDA who, the Court will recall, had testified by affidavit and had identified a certain book which his testimony established had been ordered destroyed by himself as Minister of Education in 1945.

22

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

TAMON MAEDA, recalled as a witness on behalf of the prosecution, testified as follows:

THE PRESIDENT: Witness, you are still on your former oath.

MR. HAMMACK: The book itself, may it please the Court, being document No. 1675 and thereafter being marked exhibit No. 141. Excerpts from the book, which were offered and received into evidence, had been read by myself at a time when an objection was made for the reason that copies of the book itself had not been served upon all counsel. The Court took the objection under consideration and thereafter made its ruling that the book should be offered to the Secretariat where it would be available to counsel for the defense and that the excerpts from the same should be offered into evidence and received and the reading of the same completed.

I do not wish, may it please the Court, to unduly emphasize the direct testimony of this witness, so I will ask the Court at this time whether or not it is necessary or whether they wish that I should refresh their memory in connection with his direct testimony.

THE PRESIDENT: No.

MR. HAMMACK: Reading from the exhibit No. 141 which will shortly be completed, may it please the Court, "page 79, line 7" of the volume itself which is in evidence and available to counsel -- excerpts are as follows:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

(Reading): "As I have thus far stated, home is a training place of the Imperial subjects. It is in the home life, simple and frugal, where the Gods and forefathers are duly revered, and where family work is assiduously pursued. That the noble national spirit, sturdy yet affectionate, is trained and developed, and loyal subjects that are capable of successfully enhancing and supporting the prosperity of the Imperial Throne are brought up. It is here too, that the spirit of a truly harmonious home life is fostered, where every member is glad to share in on the others' sorrows as well as their joys. (p. 81, line 5) -- In our country, one's occupation was originally the duty that they owed to perform for the sake of the Emperors, each in his assigned part of the state affairs, and it was handed down from generation to generation. With the changes in times, the type of work gradually took a different form. The underlying meaning of occupations in our country was not in the making of profits, but in the production itself, and they were preserved in the custom of respecting labor for labor's sake. (p. 84, line 8) -- You can never consider those

that dare to evade law or sacrifice others for the purpose of profit, or those that neglect others in diversity if no profit is involved and solely aim at profit making as loyal to the country by being true to their jobs. At the present time, especially the small and medium traders and manufacturers are in a wretched plight. but nevertheless we must think over the conditions prevailing at home and abroad and devote ourselves to our true duty, positively engaging in commerce and, thereby, perform our duty to the country.

"To fulfill our respective roles with a clear understanding of what part of the national activity each of us is charged with, no matter what work we may be engaged in, and by dropping all ideas of personal interests and profits reviving the old custom of our forefathers who did their best to serve the state, is truly the cardinal point for the way of the subject.

(p. 89, line 8-11) -- "The China Incident is indeed the very sacred undertaking for the purpose of diffusing the idea with which the foundation of our Empire was originally purported, not only in Asia, but to all parts of the world, and the

responsibilities shouldered by the 100,000,000
people of Japan cannot by any means be slighted.
We have a long way to go before we can hope to
achieve the Empire's mission and succeed in setting
up a new order, and we must, of course, be prepared to face a good many obstacles yet."

You may cross-examine.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney. CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MAJOR BLAKENEY:

Q Mr. Witness, I call your attention to paragraph 2 of page 2 of the English edition of your affidavit in which you state that at the time of the signing of the Anti-Comintern Pact two officers, one from the General Staff Office, one from the Ministry of War, called upon you to express disapproval of a speech that you had made.

A That is true.

Q It was not a question. The question is, can you give us their names?

A I received their name cards at that time, but I have lost them, and I cannot recall their names exactly. But the facts are as I told you.

Q Then, can you tell us which of these officers, whether the one from the General Staff Office or the one from the Ministry of War, had been Attache in Germany and which had been Attache in Italy?

A If my memory does not fail me, I think that the officer who had come from the Ministry of War had been Attache to Italy, and the officer who had come from the General Staff, Attache to Germany. As to their rank, the officer who had been to Italy was a

25

1936?

	Major, and the one who had been to Germany was a
2	Lieutenant-Colonel.
3	Q Then, in the small matter of the rank of
4	these two officers your memory did fail you when you
5	stated in your affidavit that they were both Lieut-
6	enant-Colonels?
7	A Yes. I stated at that time they were
8	Lieutenant- Colonels.
9	THE MONITOR: What I have just stated is
10	correct.
11	Q Did both of these officers tell you that
12	their interest in calling upon you was because they
13	had been Attaches in the countries which were parties
14	to the Anti-Comintern Pact?
15	A I don't believe that they told me that they
16	had come to oppose my views because they had been
17	attached to the Embassy, but they told me, I be-
18	lieve, that it was because, having been in Italy and
19	Germany, they knew how things were over there. They
20	came to see me because of my known opposition to the
21	Anti-Comintern Pact
22	THE MONITOR: Generally speaking, they
23	came to see me, et cetera.

Q This you say was about 1936. Was it in

1	A I cannot say definitely if it was in 1936.
2	It was about that time.
3	Q Did these officers or either of them make
4	any statement to you concerning who had sent them?
5	A No, they did not.
6	MAJOR BLAKENEY: That is all.
7	THE PRESIDENT: Mr. McManus.
8	CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)
9	BY MR. McMANUS:
10	Q Mr. MAEDA, what is the Imperial Rescript
11	on Education?
12	A It is a rescript by which the Emperor
13	MEIJI told the people from a biblical point of view
14	what their way as subjects were and also to subjects
15	what their way as human beings was.
16	Q Did you and do you believe in the principles
17	contained therein?
18	A I did believe, and I do.
19	The state of the s
20	foster ultra-nationalism or militarism?
21	
22	A Definitely, no. But the wrong interpre-
23	tations which were given later to this rescript may
24	have fostered such thoughts.
	THE MONITOR: Correction: "Wrong interpre-

tations" should read "various interpretations."

Do you say then that before the Manchurian Incident education in Japan was actually distorted? 2 It is difficult to generalize in this way. Among the educators at that time there were very fine people who stressed the human side of education. Among the government circles there were also many people who laid stress on these points. But the

military stressed particularly militaristic point of view. The militaristic leaders tried to lead education in militaristic ways and nationalistic ways.

This happened also before the Manchurian Incident, but it was very notable afterwards.

Well, would you not say, Mr. Witness, that teachers themselves in the colleges and in the middle schools might have been responsible for any deviation from this Imperial Rescript on Education?

Some of them certainly have.

Would you say, Mr. MAEDA, that the Imperial Rescript bases its foundation on rejection or contempt of foreign countries?

It is certain that it is not based on any such idea of contempt for others.

Do you know, Mr. MAEDA, the date when the military training in colleges and middle schools was commenced?

1

3

4

5

6 7

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

A I do not remember.

Q Do you know the date when the army officers were assigned to schools for educational purposes?

MR. HAMMACK: I am going to object, your Honor, to that line of questioning on the ground it is outside the scope of the affi.avit.

THE PRESIDENT: I think we already have those answers anyhow.

A I do not know the details.

Q Mr. MAEDA, you stated that military officers instructed the heads of the school. Do you not mean by this that the officers sometimes gave advice to the heads of the school?

A They certainly must have given at times simple advice, but they did not forget to impress that behind them was the big power of the army.

I wish to add, for the honor of certain educators -- I wish to add a few sentences: It was not only -- in most cases, when this military training was held in the schools, the attached officers did not simply give their advice but really dictated their word to the assembly of professors, and the director had just to carry out what they said. This occurred very frequently after war broke out.

3

1

2

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

school.

THE MONITOR: "Military assembly" should read "instructors meeting" or "instructors conference."

A (Continuing) I wish to add, in case the interpretation had only mentioned that it was simply matters relating to military training, that it was

matters relating to the local management of the

MAEDA CROSS

Wolf & Spratt

Q Now, Mr. MAEDA, is it not quite possible that some of these officers might have exceeded their authority?

A I think that may have been the case.

Q And is it not quite possible that some of these officers individually departed from the Imperial Rescript principles against their specific instructions?

MR. HAMMACK: I wish to object, your
Honor, on the grounds that it presupposes that there
might have been specific instructions for an army
officer to have obeyed the Imperial Rescript. I
wish to object, may it please the Court, to the
question as to the form for the reason that it presupposes that army officers were instructed before
to assume those duties, to obey the Imperial Rescript. There is not any word in the record to read
that that was so.

THE PRESIDENT: The real objection to the question is the utter uselessness of any answer that it would elicit; anything is possible.

The question is disallowed.

Q Did not, Mr. Witness, most ministers of education foster and promulgate theories of the Imperial Rescript?

3,134

MAEDA CROSS

 A Certainly, it is.

Q Now, before the Manchurian Incident, Mr.
MAEDA, would you not say that because of newspaper articles, editorials, speeches, and so forth, that it was the public opinion of the Japanese people themselves that Manchuria was considered the life-line of Japan?

A If I remember rightly, the terms "life-line" were used after the Manchurian Incident; but as to what you have just stated, it is certain that the fact that the Japanese rights and interests were disregarded by the Chinese side was prevalent before the Incident. Anyhow, the word "life-line" was, I think, after the Incident broke out.

that line of cross-examination is useless. What does it matter to you if the Japanese people did think they needed a part of China? Their honest belief, if it be an honest belief, as to their needs for part of China, is not justification for an aggressive war.

That is directed to you, Mr. McManus, and not to the witness.

MR. McMANUS: If your Honor pleases, this conspiracy indictment charges a group of men with having promoted an aggressive war. Now, this witness,

CROSS

in his affidavit, states or infers that these men were responsible for promoting propaganda to cause the Manchurian Incident. I am trying to bring out that if it were the opinion of the Japanese people themselves, how then was the responsibility of this group of men to have this conspiracy or to promote this conspiracy for the propaganda here?

THE PRESIDENT: The existence of the conspiracy is not negatived by any evidence that the Japanese people themselves desired what the alleged conspirators sought. You do not disprove conspiracy by saying the Japanese people wanted this anyhow.

MR. McMANUS: If the Court please, it is not my intention to argue with the President, but might I ask. If it is a national policy how can it be a conspiracy of individuals?

THE PRESIDENT: There could be nothing more natural than a conspiracy to give effect to a national policy?

BY MR. McMANUS (Continuing)

Q Mr. MAEDA, on page 2 of your affidavit you state -- would you please name the violent organizations who would threaten newspaper editors and writers to which you refer?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

If you do not tell me the names of these associations I can't say anything much. There were a great number of these groups at that time, and I cannot say which did what at that time. THE MONITOR: Correction: With regard to these organizations' names, I cannot say. Your answer, I take it then, is that you do not know. MR. HAMMACK: I object to your making the answer. The answer speaks for itself. THE PRESIDENT: We will recess now for fifteen minutes. (Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was taken until 1500, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

.

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

3

4

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Goldberg & Mors

	MARSHAL	OF	THE	COURT:	The	Tribunal	is	now
resumed.								

BY MR. MCMANUS (Continued):

Q Mr. MAEDA, I call your attention to one of the books named in your affidavit which you state you had destroyed. The name of the book is "The Way of the National Subject." Is not "The Moral Code of the Japanese Subject" a more correct title than "The Way of the National Subject?"

A I think "Way of Subjects" is sufficient. However, if you like to change it, that is up to you.

Q Now, as you state that there are some objectionable parts in this book, is it not because this book was compiled -- or is the compilation of all committees of education, probably about five or six committees?

A At that time I was not connected with the Minister of Education, and, therefore, I am not familiar as to how this book was written or compiled.

Q Well, in 1941, when this book was published, you were the Governor of Nigata Prefecture, were you not?

A No, I was then in New York.

Q When were you the Governor of Nigata Prefecture?

Summer of 1943. 1 While you were Governor, was this book distributed to schools and to the communities under your jurisdiction? I did not at all distribute these books

since I assumed the Governorship of Nigata two years after the book was compiled. These books must have been distributed before I became Governor.

When you became Governor, you knew of their existence, did you not?

A Yes. I knew that the Ministry of Education had issued such a book.

You, in your position at that time, could have ordered them destroyed, isn't that so?

MR. HANNACK: To which I object, as argumentative, may it please the Court.

THE PRESIDENT: Objection overruled.

At that time I was under the instructions of the Cabinet and, being an official serving under the Cabinet, I, as a subordinate official, cannot destroy such books by my own will.

There is one other point I wish to have considered, and that is that I was Governor at a time when Japan was in the midst of war; and during war it was my, as well as other officials', responsibility

2

3 4

5

6

8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

of others, to reconcile all differences, if any, in order to help the country in its war effort. Therefore I, as a Japanese subject, could not do such a thing as destroy such material.

Q Well, you state in your affidavit, Mr. MAEDA, that when you became Minister of Education, that you ordered these books destroyed after perusing them and reading them. Now, as a matter of fact, weren't you ordered to destroy these books?

A Absolutely not. It was done according to my own free will as Minister.

Q Now you state also that one of the reasons -that one of the objectionable parts of the book was
the confusion of facts with mystery and legend. In
what way did you find that objectionable?

MR. HAMMACK: To which I object to the question, your Honor, for the reason he does not so state in connection with the volume that is in evidence. He states that in connection generally with many textbooks.

THE PRESIDENT: What is the question based on, Mr. McManus?

MR. MCMANUS: I just wanted to point out, if the Court please, that is there anything objection-able about confusing facts with mystery and legend,

•

which is apparently the Japanese religion. I am
certain that possibly the Bible mixes -- confuses
facts with mystery and legend. What is objectionable

about that?

THE PRESIDENT: It seems very remote to me.

MR. MCMANUS: Well, I am just pointing out, if the Court pleases, that one of the main reasons why this witness gives as destroying these books is because of that fact, and it is located on the third paragraph on page two of his affidavit.

THE PRESIDENT: We will take his answer.

A I am not familiar with the law. However, if the Court would permit me, I should like to explain two or three points or reasons why I had ordered these books destroyed. However, my statement may go beyond the scope of the question. However, if the Court permits, I shall be glad to do so.

THE PRESIDENT: You have our permission.

A One of my reasons for destroying the book, having the book destroyed, was that its general tendency or underlying philosophy was very objectionable, although there were one or two other passages here and there which were quite acceptable.

First, I should like to say that the book pointed out or indicated that Japan was greater than

2

4

3

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

15

16

....

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

3

4

5

8

9

11

12

14

15

16

17_.

19

20

22

23

25

other countries and by mixing legend, myth and facts, it tried to show that Japan was a country especially selected and blessed by Providence, and emphasized that point. And also, it tended to foster prejudice and animosity against foreign culture.

The second point which I wish to state is that it greatly emphasized the Imperial way, that is Kuokoku no michi or Imperial way, that anything that violated this precept was not regarded as learning.

In short, it placed the State above truth and justice.

Another point which I wish to point out as being objectionable is that there is the way of the people and another, the way of human beings. This fact the Imperial Rescript on Education, that is, the way of human beings, does not particularly mention or emphasize. The main emphasis was placed on the way of the people or way of the nation or the way of subjects; and the way of human beings was entirely neglected. From this standpoint, as you say, that such a thought entirely negates the idea of building a cultural state.

Q Now, Mr. MAEDA, I am talking about all of the textbooks that you had destroyed where you make that statement that they were confusing facts with myth and legend. Now were not these books in existence a long time?

A Yes, I should think it did exist for a long time up to that point, but in this new era I do not think such books should be permitted to exist.

Q Yes, but were not, then, these books issued to follow the principles of the Imperial Rescript of Education?

A I think you misunderstand. The Imperial Rescript was not granted in order to give birth to a book such as "The Way of Subjects". "The Way of Subjects," as a matter of fact, distorted those principles as expressed in the Rescript.

Q Now when you state that you, yourself, destroyed these books, and as a subordinate of yours was punished for not destroying these books, can you tell me whether or not he was punished by you or someone else?

MR. HALMACK: To which I object, may it please the Court, on the grounds it is beyond the scope of the direct examination. There is not one word in there indicating anyone was punished. The testimony is that this man, as Minister of Education, ordered those books destroyed, period.

THE PRESIDENT: We will allow him to answer.

1 2

A As the prosecutor has said, I did issue the order, but I have not stated that I have punished anybody. I do not recall such a fact. My memory is not very good, but did I state in my affidavit that I had punished a subordinate?

Q Was a subordinate of yours ever punished for not complying to the orders for destroying these books, if you know?

MR. HAMMACK: I object. To which I object, may it please the Court, that there is not a word of testimony in there that anyone failed to destroy them or that anyone was punished.

THE PRESIDENT: What is the value of the question or the answer? What is the value of it?

MR. MCMANUS: It is just to test the witness' integrity. I am asking it to show that -- to disprove -- within an endeavor to disprove the statement that he, himself, by his own will, destroyed these books.

I am trying to test the witness' credibility.

MR. HAMMACK: I object to the form of the question, may it please the Court, of counsel attempting to test the credibility of the witness.

THE PRESIDENT: That question would not test his credibility. We disallow it.

MR. MCMANUS: I have no further cross-

examination.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Kleiman.

CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY CAPTAIN KLEIMAN:

Q Mr. MAEDA, were not some of these books, some of these textbooks that you ordered destroyed written during the Meiji Era?

A Again it is a question of my own memory.

If you have anything written there, I should like to have it shown to me. The books I had ordered destroyed were "Kokutai no Hongi" or "Fundamental Principles of National Polity" and "The Way of the Subjects." Other books were also ordered destroyed in accordance with the policy which I had decided upon.

Q Well, don't you remember the dates of some of the books that you refer to? I am trying to find out from you whether or not these books were written recently or whether these books had been written a long time ago after the establishment of the Meiji Era.

A All textbooks in Japan, as a matter of custom, are revised after four or five years of use, and recent books -- textbooks that are now used in the schools were written in the Showa Era. Many books were revised, especially after the outbreak of the

Pacific War.

Q On page three of your affidavit you said that the military officers instructed the principals of the schools as to the courses and the administration of the school system. Among the courses that were taught in an elementary school was not Japanese language taught?

THE PRESIDENT: That is utterly impossible.

Was not the Japanese language taught in the Japanese schools?

captain kleiman: May it please the Tribunal, now I am truly trying to get answered a question that the Court asked, itself, about two months ago, what are these courses that were taught? It has never been brought out by prosecution, and we, of the defense, wish to make the picture clear for the Tribunal. If the Tribunal does not wish the questions asked, I will refrain from them.

THE PRESIDENT: The Tribunal does not wish to have that question asked.

М	1	CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: All right, your Honor.
or	2	Q Was arithmetic taught to those students?
e	3	THE PRESIDENT: Well, that is impossible.
&	4	This is a serious case. You are before the Inter-
A	5	national Military Tribunal for the Far East trying
b r a m	6	former leaders of Japan of the greatest series of
	7	crimes ever committed against men.
	8	CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: May it please your Honor,
	9	is it not important at this stage to show that after
	10	the promulgation of the Imperial Rescript of 1941
	11	these courses which are taught in schools of every
	12	country in the world
	13	THE PRESIDENT: Please continue to put ques-
	14	tions.
	15	CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: All right, your Honor.
	16	Was music, penmanship, drawing, Japanese
	17	history, needle work, taught in the schools?
	18	THE PRESIDENT: The witness need not answer.
	19	CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: No further questions.
	20	MR. OHARA: I am OHARA, counsel for the
	21	defendant OKAWA.
	22	CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)
	23	BY MR. OHARA:
	24	Q The witness said that when he signed the
	25	The state of the s

affidavit he had the Japanese text first -- when he

signed the affidavit he had first the English text
first translated into Japanese and then signed it.

Is that so?

A In my recollection I talked to the prosecutor
in English and as I recoll I signed the English

A In my recollection I talked to the prosecutor in English, and as I recall I signed the English affidavit.

Q I have here the Japanese affidavit of yours and I will read the last paragraph from your affidavit slowly. Would you listen to it. The last paragraph of the first page. "The military and ultra-nationalistic groups attributed the weak-kneed condition of finance and weak-kneed condition of Japan during these years to too much liberal tendencies on the part of the government and people."

A Yes, I think I made such a statement.

What do you mean by such expressions that you have used as "weak-kneed conditions of finance" and "weak-kneed condition of Japan?"

A I think you are referring to the situation which existed about the time of the Manchurian Incident. If so, I am referring to the economic depression, of financial panic and the deflationary conditions which prevailed in Japan which retarded Japanese development.

Q When you speak of this weak-kneed financial

ENW/AS

and national situation, do you also include the corruption of the political parties and the weakened vitality and lack of morale of the people?

A Yes, I include them also.

Then you say that those are attributed to too much liberal tendencies at that time.

A I don't know what kind of words or language
I used in the English text but when I speak of liberal
tendency I mean that there was a mistaken understanding of that term, that is, the misunderstanding of
liberalism with its accompaning responsibility and,
therefore, gave rise to a reform doctrine.

Q You state also in your affidavit, that is before the passage which I have just quoted, "through 1926, 1927 and 1928 the general atmosphere in Japan was tense." Are you referring to the period after that time?

A Generally I am speaking about approximately that time.

Q All the Japanese leaders then were concerned about this program and they are all of the opinion that something must be done about that. Wasn't that so?

A Yes, I think so, but there were two ways of thinking on that subject. One school of thought

4

1

2

3

5 6

8

10 11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22

24

25

23

believed in resorting to the constitutional method, where the other advocated -- believed in the fact that the end justified the means and even favored the use of force, if necessary, to attain the desired end.

At that time, in those days, bribery was a common practice in elections and newcomers, even if they wish to run for the election, could not be elected without resorting to that method.

THE PRESIDENT: That is a statement, not a question.

(Continued) Was it not so?

Yes. I think that such a situation existed. However, movements for the purification of elections were carried on later and of this movement I do know with some familiarity because I was connected with the movement.

Have you ever read the works of OKAWA?

As to his voluminous writings of his I do recall having read his book "The Two Thousand Six Hundred Years of Japanese History," but other than that I have only read some of his essays in Japanese magazines.

In the third page of your Japanese affidavit , Mr. Witness, that is, in the middle of the page, you

r---

state that OKAWA always advocated expansion into Manchuria as well as domination of Manchuria. He didn't always constantly harp on that, did he?

CROSS

A If I am to speak accurately, I should say I would be mistaken if I had said "constantly" or "always."

MR. OHARA: I understand.

DR. KIYOSE: That is all. No further crossexamination, your Honor.

MR. HAMMACK: No more re-direct, your Honor.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused)

MR. DONIHI: May it please the Tribunal, the witness NAKAI is in court and the prosecution should like to have him take the stand.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: Mr. President, this witness has been previously sworn.

MR. DONIHI: Before the witness has taken the stand, the prosecution should like to direct the Court's attention to the fact that in his affidavit this witness has made reference to the film "Critical Period of Japan" which has been twice unsuccessfully brought to the Court's attention, as I am sure the Tribunal will recall, due to mechanical defects.

KIMBEI NAKAI, recalled as a witness on behalf of the prosecution, testified as follows: 2 THE PRESIDENT: Witness, you are still on 3 your former oath.

WITNESS: I shall do so.

MR. DONIHI: It has never been the prosecution's desire to insist that the Tribunal sit through the entire twelve reels of this picture. The defense, however, feels that it cannot properly cross-examine the witness without a full showing of the moving picture "Critical Period of Japan." The film is in evidence. If the Tribunal desires to see this picture before having the witness cross-examined, the prosecution, of course, desires to show it and will not object to showing the entire picture even though we are aware of the fact that many reels make an attempt to dramatize certain Japanese customs and history in a manner that would appeal possibly only to the Oriental mind.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, haven't you said erough about the picture, Mr. Donihi? When do you want us to see it? This afternoon?

MR. DONIHI: In order to view the entire picture, Mr. President, it would consume the better part of two hours and, of course, that would bring

1

4 5

6

7

10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21 22

23

NAKAI

1	us up close to six o'clock this evening.
2	THE PRESIDENT: We will recess now until
3	half past nine on Monday next.
4	(Whereupon, at 1550, an adjournment
5	was taken until Monday, 5 August 1946, at
6	0930.)
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	